

13 means coupled with the determining means for removing the at least one
14 character if the character type is a third character type and if the width of the at least
15 one column heading is greater than the particular width, the third character type being a
16 space; and

17 means coupled with the determining means for truncating the column heading if
18 the width of the at least one column heading is greater than the particular width and if
19 the at least one column heading does not contain any character of the first character
20 type, the second character type or the third character type.

1 74. The method of Claim 32 wherein the entry includes column heading in a table.

REMARKS

This continuation application presents Claims 32-74 for examination. For reasons set forth below we believe these claims are patentable over the art of record.

The claims were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Figure 4 of the prior art submitted by applicant.

In response, applicant argues that there is a fundamental difference between applicant's claim of abbreviation and the prior art which uses truncation shown in Figure 4 and discussed on page 3 of applicant's specification. In truncation a portion of the word is cut off without any regard for the relationship between the original word and the remainder. As is shown in Figure 4 with truncation, two column headings can have the same shortened version. When this occurs, it is very difficult for one viewing the table to determine what each of these columns represent. One can imagine the confusion resulting from such a technique when many different columns are viewed in a table.

In applicant's method of reducing width by abbreviation selective characters are removed from the word and the remaining or abbreviated portion of the word has a traceable "relationship" with the word which is abbreviated. By way of example Figure 8 shows a chart based upon abbreviation, whereas Figure 4 shows one based upon truncation. It is clear that the Figure 8 table can be better understood than Figure 4. For example, columns 250 and 260 in Figure 8 clearly distinguish between the two disks, whereas in Figure 4 there is no distinction. Stated another way, Figure 4 is confusing; Figure 8 is not.

Applicant further argues that even the dictionary definition of 'abbreviation' and 'truncation' clearly indicate that there is a distinct difference between the two. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines 'abbreviation' and 'truncation' as follows:

abbreviation: 1. the acts of or product of abbreviating. 2. A shortened form of a word or phrase used chiefly in writing to represent the complete form.

truncate: 1. To shorten by or as if by cutting off the end or top; to lop.

It is clear from these definitions that truncations and abbreviations are different words meaning different things and when used within a claim clearly distinguishes from one another. In view of the difference, applicant argues that 'abbreviation' as used in the claim provides a new process solving the problems that are associated with truncation and set forth on pages 8 and 9 of applicant's specification. Since applicant's invention by using abbreviation solves these problems, it is clear evidence that the prior art teaching as set forth in Figure 4 would not lead an artisan to applicant's invention of abbreviation.

In addition, applicant argues that by solving the problem associated with truncation applicant provides a new method abbreviation and benefits not present in the prior art. The benefits from applicant's invention are partially shown in Figure 8 and are set forth on pages 12 and 13 of applicant's specification. It is applicant's position that a new method coupled with benefits not present in the prior art are again indicia of unobviousness.

Finally, applicant argues that the examiner failed to make out a prima facie case of obviousness. This is so because the examiner gives no logical or concrete reasons why an artisan viewing the teaching in Figure 4 would arrive at the invention claimed by applicant. It is settled law that in order for the prior art to render claims obvious there should be some suggestion or logical reasons why an artisan viewing that prior art, in this case Figure 4, would arrive at applicant's claims. The examiner has failed to give concrete or logical reasons and as a consequence the claims are not obvious in view of Figure 4.

The examiner had rejected claims 7, 11-13 (reproduced in this continuation application as claims 49 and 53-55) under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. The examiner states in part: "it is not reasonable since the specification states that in a preferred embodiment there are three types of character types: lower case vowels, lower case letter, and space (page 14, lines 3-4)."

In response, applicant argue that the specification clearly states that there are alternate embodiments to the preferred embodiments and even set forth an example of the alternate embodiment (see page 14, lines 3-8). Applicant argues that applicant has a right not only to claim preferred embodiment but alternate embodiments especially when they are suggested in the specification. Therefore, applicant argues that claims


Serial No. 09/089,098

PATENT
IBM Docket No. RA9-98-003

49 and 53-55 relate to alternate embodiments which is well within the purview of applicant's specification. As a consequence, applicant argues that the claims do set forth the subject matter which applicant considers as embodiment of its invention.

It is believed that the present amendment answers all the issues raised by the examiner. Reconsideration is hereby requested and an early allowance of all the claims is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Joscelyn G. Cockburn, Reg. No. 27,069
Attorney of Record
IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept. 2Y7/656
P.O. Box 12195
RTP, NC 27709

JGC:ko
919-543-9036
FAX 919-543-3634